



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The results of the methods of the Emmanuel movement for the treatment of those with nervous disorders, "neurasthenics" and "psychasthenics," are stated with full recognition of the failures of the methods. He states clearly that with such cases and with alcoholics and others the methods employed have a place only as supplementary to those now in use by the best physicians.

The movement, unlike Christian Science, breaks neither with scientific medicine nor with the church. Mr. Powell takes no case for treatment until a physician has examined the patient and referred him to the clinic for this particular treatment. He permits no member of another church who has been helped in his clinic to join or even attend his church. He refuses to wreck the movement by making it a proselyting agency.

J. L. GILLIN

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

---

*The Standard of Living in New York City.* By ROBERT COIT CHAPIN, PH.D., Horace White Professor of Economics and Finance, Beloit College, Wisconsin. New York: Published for the Russell Sage Foundation by the Charities Publication Committee, 1909. Pp. xv+372. \$2.00.

*The Standard of Living in New York City* contains the results of the study of this subject by a special committee of the New York State Conference of Charities and Correction, a paper on the "Meaning and Value of the Standard of Living," by Mr. Frank Tucker, a preliminary report for the committee by Dr. Lee K. Frankel, a brief comparative study of the standards in nine other cities in the state of New York, special reports by Dr. Frank P. Underhill, assistant professor of physiological chemistry, Yale University, on the "Nutritive Sufficiency of the Food Purchased by the Families Studied," a "Workingman's Budget," translated from Le Play, a selected bibliography, and index. The main body of the work is by Dr. Chapin and is an elaborate statistical, diagrammatic, and textual presentation of the findings from the budgets of three hundred and eighteen families with annual incomes between six hundred and eleven hundred dollars, including occasionally, however, twenty-five families whose incomes were below six hundred dollars, and forty-eight whose incomes were above eleven hundred dollars. Nearly all of the families consisted of father, mother, and

three children not of earning age. Two other very important parts of the work by Dr. Chapin are his critique of "Workingman's Budgets in Statistical Literature," and the Bibliography.

Among the more important final conclusions reached by the author are the following:

1. "An income under eight hundred dollars is not enough to permit the maintenance of the normal standard" (p. 245). This is worded as though it were universal but it should probably be expanded by adding, "for a workingman's family of father, mother, and three children not of earning age in New York City, according to prices obtaining in 1907." If the validity of the original entries is accepted this proposition is conclusively supported.

2. "An income of nine hundred dollars or more probably permits the maintenance of the normal standard, at least so far as physical man is concerned" (p. 246). The phrase "or more" in this proposition should be either omitted or given some limitation.

3. "It seems probable that on eight hundred dollars to nine hundred dollars, the standard prevailing among Bohemians, Russians, Austrians, and Italians may be maintained, but that is the exception rather than the rule when more expensive standards of the Americans and kindred nationalities are maintained on this amount" (p. 247).

There are many half-way houses on the road to these final conclusions such as the propositions concerning the proportional distribution of the expenditures among items of rent, fuel and light, food, clothing, insurance, health and sundries, and those on the variations of this distribution with the variations in income. But important though they are in themselves and as stages in the journey, they are too numerous to recount in this brief review.

Dr. Underhill finds "that in general when less than twenty-two cents per man per day is spent for food the nourishment derived is insufficient, and when more than twenty-two cents per man per day is expended the family is well nourished." Scientific accuracy is not claimed for this, however. This was Dr. Underhill's finding on one hundred of the budgets collected in New York City in 1907, whereas he found a slightly lower figure for Buffalo in 1908—due partly, however, to a slight difference in the schedules used in the two cities.

The value of Dr. Chapin's book can hardly be overestimated. It is probably the best study that has been published on this subject,

certainly the best in English. In such an investigation, however, there are many difficulties. The great importance of the subject itself (see especially the paper by Mr. Tucker, pp. 253-61), the conspicuous character of this undertaking, the timeliness of the investigation, the unquestionable merit of the conclusions, and the fact that already the results are being incorporated in both the economic and sociological literature of the country—these are sufficient reasons why some of the difficulties should be pointed out, both for the sake of evaluating the work under review, and in the interest of method.

Aside from the difficulties of textual composition and schematic representation that are great in such a statistical study, there are not many difficulties that a little experience and thought cannot *overcome after the original entries have been finally accepted*. True, there are many pitfalls in the interpretation of accepted figures, but expert criticism may readily correct them. But even a novice in social investigation cannot fail to recognize that the uncertainties, the approximations, and the personal equation that operate before the first tables are made up make fractional percentages in derivative combinations seem ridiculous, unless, perchance, the original process was simply counting and the induction very extensive, as in mortality tables, for example. *The figures having been accepted*, tables, percentages, and variations come easily, but there is a travail of tables.

One of the first questions that comes up is whether an intimate knowledge of the personal affairs of the family and household, necessary to fill the schedule used in this investigation, can be obtained by one visit, or at best by a few visits, by an enumerator or investigator. The nature of the information necessary for determining the standard of living is such that only a sustained personal contact of the investigator and family can yield very complete and accurate data. The inconsistency of the intimate nature of the information desired, and the impersonal method of the schedule may throw some light on the omission from the final report of any information concerning the personal habits, capacities, and characteristics of the members of the family, although the schedule called for information on these points.

On this point it is suggestive to compare the method used by Mrs. Moore<sup>1</sup> in a study of two hundred families with whom she or her small number of helpers already had and continued to maintain

<sup>1</sup>Mrs. Louise Bolard Moore, *Wage Earner's Budgets*.

friendly and everyday relations. Mrs. Moore's study continued through a period of two years and included many accounts actually kept for a year. The impersonal, incidental contacts of the former study are thus set over in strong contrast to the personal, sustained ones of the latter. Although these are to be preferred, there are practical difficulties in realizing them. Such connections as Mrs. Moore sustained to her families do not exist on scales sufficiently wide, and where they are to be found it is doubtful whether the families are representative, just because they are by that fact different from others. Dr. Chapin, himself, has said that the ideal method is to have an exact account kept for a full year, but this was forbidden to his committee by practical reasons.

There is another difficulty that was encountered. The committee recognized from the first that the value of the schedules depended upon the persons who filled them out. This is eminently true. Nevertheless, more than eighty different persons were engaged in filling the schedules, fifty-seven reports coming from forty-three volunteers, thirty-four from trade-union officials, and five hundred and fifty-one from twenty-one different paid workers. The author does not say how many different investigators submitted the three hundred and eighteen schedules generally used. Under the most favorable conditions, however, it is evident that experience in asking questions and filling schedules could not have helped much, that uniformity of ability in estimating could not be secured, and that nothing could eliminate the many personal equations represented. It is presumed that the accepted schedules were checked by some one or few persons, but this is precisely a process of scaling up or scaling down, of approximating, probably done by those who lacked an intimate knowledge of the families.

Not only were there many workers with few schedules each, but the strangers met only a few times. The author remarks that sometimes several visits were necessary to fill the schedule, as though this was unusual. Probably in the majority of instances only one visit was made. Some attempt was made to have the families keep an account for a week or longer, but the author says that "in the majority of cases, however, it was not practicable to secure account books, and the visitor sat down with the housewife and ran over the schedule with her, getting estimates where figures were not available. . . . All this required time, and the patience of mother and visitor was sometimes exhausted before the end was reached"

(p. 30). Under such circumstances accuracy is difficult to secure. Indeed the author says: "In addition to indifference and suspiciousness on the part of those interviewed, ignorance, misunderstanding of the meaning of the questions asked, forgetfulness, and impatience gave rise to inaccuracies" (p. 32). The spirit of the situation was hardly conducive to statistically accurate statements.

Closely related to the difficulty just described is another one, that of stating and estimating the expenditures and the income. The schedules were filled between "the middle of June and the end of August." It is evident that at this season it would be most difficult for a housewife to recall the amount of money spent for fuel, light, winter clothing, and schooling. Nor can these be estimated from the cost of these same things during the week of the interview. Furthermore, it is certain that the householder could never recall exactly or estimate with any degree of accuracy the amount of unemployment during a year, whether on the part of the father or the others. Added to this is the difficulty of remembering or estimating the different rates of pay received, or how long any rate continued. Nor can the housewife be certain how much money she received from lodgers during a year.

There is less probability of error in arriving at the cost of the staple articles of food, rent, and insurance. There is, however, a considerable doubt as to whether these can be very accurately determined by the schedule method. For example, it is not at all evident that the total annual expenditure for food is equal to fifty-two times what it was for one week in July. This uncertainty is more manifest if we consider the variation in use of such articles as meat, fresh vegetables, and canned goods. If removals are frequent even the amount of rent is hard to determine with sufficient accuracy to justify fractional percentages in the distribution of expenditures. An estimate of the amount annually spent for insurance made upon a weekly payment in July may easily miss the mark on account of the buying of new policies, or the lapses of old ones within the year.

It should be noted especially that all these difficulties are greater the lower the standard of living is; the less regular the employment, or the more variable and numerous the wage-earners in the family, the greater the ignorance and lax methods of keeping any record, the greater becomes the liability to error. Yet it is such families whose standards of living need most to be determined and elevated.

But this is not all. Dr. Chapin has very clearly made the point that the standard of living is not shown so much in the amount of money expended for such staples as food, rent, and clothing, as in that spent for furniture, dues and contributions, recreation and amusement, education and reading, funeral expenses, cost of moving, etc.

Mrs. Moore makes the same point. However, it is precisely these things that are most difficult to learn by any method, and which the author in several places says could not be successfully secured by a single-visit, schedule method (e. g., pp. 182, 198, 206, 210, 219, 222). On this difficult point the personal sustained method used by Mrs. Moore seems to promise better results. When one question was asked, whether families were sufficiently nourished or not, other difficulties were discovered. In addition to the lack of agreement among physiologists as to the amount of protein, fats, and carbohydrates needed by a man, or the proper balance of these constituents (pp. 320, 321), there is the grave difficulty of finding out what quantities of these classes of foods were consumed by the members of the families studied. There is one uncertainty as to what amount and balance should obtain, and another one as to what amount and balance did exist in the dietary of the families. The former question belongs to the physiologists, the latter to the student of the standard of living.

A moment's thought makes these uncertainties quite noticeable. The findings of Dr. Underhill were based on the quantities *bought*, not upon those consumed. The shrinkage in preparation, poor cooking, and service, the waste of the left-over—not to mention the digestibility and the absorbability—these should be taken into account.

The report does not make it clear how the quantities bought were determined, whether by multiplying the weight used in a day by three hundred and sixty-five (or that used in a week by fifty-two), or by dividing the amount spent in a given year or week for a given article by the average price. It is of course well known that housewives usually buy so many cents' worth, rather than so many pounds, pecks, quarts, etc. Moreover, the quality of articles bought is nowhere adequately shown, nor is any account taken of variations of need, as in sickness and unemployment. Under these conditions it was impossible to decide with exactness whether the families were sufficiently nourished or not. The conclusions could

be only general statements. No one can recognize this more clearly than Dr. Underhill, who says, "It is at once clearly apparent that from such data results of any scientific value cannot be obtained, and emphasis is laid upon the fact that there has been no intention of drawing any conclusion the basis of which would necessitate exactness" (p. 319). In the investigation under review, the physiologist could not go back of the returns, and his results could not be more certain than the reports upon which he based them.

The sum-total of these difficulties should put students on their guard as to over-refinements in the interpretation of figures, originally so uncertain, and should emphasize need of careful attention to method.

The reviewer desires once more to express his appreciation of the high grade of work done by Dr. Chapin and his colaborers who have done well, using a method that has in itself many serious difficulties and some positive limitations. He himself is under great obligations to the labor of these pioneers in this field. He recognizes the fact that this criticism of method is only negative, but hopes to make a positive contribution on this point at a later time.

T. J. RILEY

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
ST. LOUIS